



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/683,729

02/07/2002

Wen-Sung Tsai

CEIP0037USA

8659

27765

7590

01/05/2007

NORTH AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION  
P.O. BOX 506  
MERRIFIELD, VA 22116

EXAMINER

LUU, MATTHEW

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3663

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

2 MONTHS

01/05/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**MAILED**

JAN 05 2007

**GROUP 3600**

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/683,729  
Filing Date: February 07, 2002  
Appellant(s): TSAI, WEN-SUNG

---

Winston Hsu  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed October 20, 2006 appealing from the Office action mailed October 11, 2006.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is incorrect.

Claim 13 has been canceled in the amended appeal brief filed October 10, 2006.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

Art Unit: 3663

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

6147664	HANSEN	11-2000
5032828	HIROSE ET AL	7-1991

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

<b>The Claimed Invention</b>	<b>The 103 Rejection</b>
	<b>Hansen (6,147,664) in view of Hirose (5,032,828)</b>
Claim 6. A display device for a computer system comprising:	Hansen discloses (Fig. 7) a display device for a computer system (550) comprising:

a screen for displaying a picture image for a user in front of the screen;	Hansen discloses (Fig. 7) a screen (200) for displaying a picture image;
a plurality of sensors <u>for detecting different colors</u> of ambient light and generating corresponding detecting signals; and	Hansen discloses (Fig. 7) a plurality of ambient light sensors (580a and 580b) (column 14, lines 28-31) <u>for detecting different ambient light intensities</u> (brightness levels) and generating a corresponding detecting signal (Fig. 9 shows a brightness voltage signal 312) (Column 15, lines 5-20); and
a controller for adjusting color levels of the picture image displayed on the screen according to the detecting signals.	Hansen discloses (Fig. 9) a controller (brightness control circuit 300) for adjusting brightness levels of the screen (200) according to the detecting signal (brightness voltage signal 312) (column 15, lines 5-20 and column 16, lines 54-58).
<b>The difference</b>	<b>Hirose (5,032,828)</b>
The only difference between the disclosure of Hansen and the claimed invention is that the claim requires a plurality of color light sensors, instead of	However, Hirose discloses (Figs. 1-4) a plurality of different colors light sensors (16a and 16b) and a controller (17) for adjusting color levels of the

the ambient brightness sensor of Hansen.	picture image displayed on the screen (11) (Column 3, line 18 to column 4, line 44).
	<b>The Reason to Combine the References</b>  Therefore, since Hansen mentions that a number of different ambient light sensors can be used for detecting ambient light (column 15, lines 51-52), it is obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the different colors light sensors (16) of Hirose in place of the ambient light sensor (580) of Hansen to adjust both of the color and brightness of the color images displayed on the screen of Hansen.

Art Unit: 3663

Regarding claims 7 and 9, Hansen discloses (Fig. 9) a brightness control circuitry (300).

Regarding claim 10, Hansen discloses (Fig. 9) the brightness of light detected by the sensor is compared to a predetermined value (reference voltage 635).

Regarding claim 12, Hirose discloses (Figs. 2-4) a plurality of different colors light sensors (16a and 16b) and a controller (17) for adjusting color levels of the picture image displayed on the screen (11). See column 3, line 18 to column 4, line 44. It is obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the different colors light sensors of Hirose into the computer display device of Hansen to provide an image display device, which enables both the color hue and brightness of the images can be adjusted.

Regarding claim 14, Hansen discloses the FED flat panel display screen. However, it is well known in the art that the LCD flat panel display screen and the FED flat panel display screen are interchangeable.

#### **(10) Response to Argument**

On page 3, stating line 25, Appellant argues "Hirose does not and should not measure ambient light". However, Appellant must aware that the examiner uses the Hansen reference for the purpose of teaching the ambient light sensors for measuring ambient light, not Hirose.

“Hansen discloses (Fig. 7) a plurality of ambient light sensors (580a and 580b) (column 14, lines 28-31) for detecting different ambient light intensities (brightness levels) and generating a corresponding detecting signal (Fig. 9 shows a brightness voltage signal 312) (Column 15, lines 5-20)”

Furthermore, claim 6, line 3 recites “a plurality of sensors for detecting different colors of ambient light”. This limitation is “**broad**”. It does not require specific colors of light such as Red, Green, and Blue being detected. Naturally, the ambient light itself has many different colors to begin with, i.e., it contains many light spectra with different light wavelengths, and thus different colors of light. Therefore, the ambient light sensors (580a and 580b) of Hansen definitely detect the ambient brightness and also “different colors of ambient light”.

Furthermore, since Hanson teaches a screen (200) for displaying a color picture image, one skilled in the art must realize that the ambient light sensors of Hansen can adjust the brightness of the image as well as the color of the image on the display screen of Hansen.

#### **Reasons for Combining Hirose With Hansen**

Hirose discloses (Figs. 1-4) a plurality of different colors light sensors (16a and 16b) and a controller (17) for adjusting color levels of the picture image displayed on the screen (11). See column 4, lines 1-44.



Since Hanson teaches a number of different ambient light sensors do exist for detecting ambient light (column 15, lines 51-52), it is obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the different colors light sensors (16) of Hirose in place of the ambient light sensors (580) of Hansen to adjust both of the color and brightness of the color image displayed on the Hansen's screen.

Furthermore, examiner also notices that the Hansen's ambient light sensor (580b) (Fig. 7) is positioned in front of the flat screen (200) for detecting the ambient light thereof. Now, by looking at Fig. 1 of Hirose, the color light sensor (16) is also positioned in front of the flat screen (12). Naturally, one skilled in the art can easily realize that the color light sensor (16) of Hirose is also functioning as "an ambient light sensor" in as much as the Hansen's ambient light sensor (580b) does.

Furthermore, the Hirose reference discloses (Figs. 2-3) a plurality of different colors light sensors (16a and 16b), wherein the sensor (16a) for detecting a blue color level and another sensor (16b) for detecting a different red color level. See column 3, lines 33-34; and column 4, lines 1-5. Therefore, a plurality of different colors light sensors (16a and 16b) read on the limitation "a plurality of sensors for detecting different color of ambient light".

#### **(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

Art Unit: 3663

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

M. Luu

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Matthew Luu', with a large, stylized initial 'M'.

**MATTHEW LUU  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Conferees:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Amare Mengistu', with a large, stylized initial 'A'.

**AMARE MENGISTU  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**

Amare Mengistu